
**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL
Tuesday, December 17, 2013
10:00 AM – 1:00 PM
Montana FWP Headquarters
1420 E. Sixth Ave, Helena, MT 59620**

PRESENT

Council Members Present:

Mack Cole (by phone)

Barbara Hall

Stevie Neuman

Earl Salley

Karen Bucklin Sanchez (by phone)

Trevor Selch

Keith Smith (by phone)

Michael Wendland (by phone)

Council Members Absent:

Mitchell Leu

Dude Tyler

Montana Department of Environmental Quality Staff Members:

John Arrigo

Kirsten Bowers

Dave Feldman

Sarah Norman

John North

Kari Smith

Amy Steinmetz

Eric Urban

Public:

Mary Beth Marks

Shane Matolyak

Clint Sestrich

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Trevor Selch called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Mack Cole moved to approve the agenda as written; Chairperson Selch seconded the motion. There was no opposition; the motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Karen Bucklin Sanchez moved to approve the December 4, 2013 meeting minutes as written; Mr. Cole seconded the motion. There was no opposition; the motion carried.

BRIEFING ITEMS

Water Pollution Control Advisory Council (WPCAC) Role –

Ms. Amy Steinmetz gave a brief introduction to Mr. John North's presentation in which she described the organizational structure of the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Mr. North, Chief Legal Counsel for DEQ, then discussed the relationship of the WPCAC to DEQ. According to Mr. North, WPCAC was created by statute in the 1970s to serve solely in an advisory capacity to DEQ on matters relating to water pollution. The statute establishing the council also references an advisory council statute that lists advisory capacity functions as furnishing advice, gathering information, and making recommendations. When combining these two statutes, the general function of WPCAC is to furnish advice, gather information, and make recommendations to DEQ on matters related to water pollution.

In the rulemaking provisions of the Water Quality Act, there is a specific provision pertaining to WPCAC that relates to all water quality rules. According to this provision, before rules are adopted, DEQ is required to send newspaper notice for three consecutive weeks. WPCAC is to be given notice of the proposed rulemaking at least 30 days prior to the date of first publication.

After DEQ receives WPCAC recommendations, they then go to the Board of Environmental Review (BER) and propose that the Board issue a rulemaking notice. Following this, there is a required comment period. At the closure of this period, the Department summarizes the comments and proposes responses to them as well as recommendations for changes in the rules. BER considers these recommendations and then either adopts, adopts with amendments, or decides not to adopt the proposed rules.

Mr. North said that he understands that there have been questions about whether the Department is required to return to WPCAC to seek advice after receiving public comments. His answer is no. WPCAC's role only pertains to the period prior to public notice.

Mr. Cole asked if there are any new water quality rules that have recently come up. Mr. North responded that, yes, perhaps six to twelve proposed rule amendments are brought to the Board each year. He added that WPCAC members receive notice of these and have an opportunity to provide recommendations before any proposals go to the Board.

Ms. Bucklin Sanchez asked how the question arose about whether DEQ is required to return to WPCAC upon receipt of public comments. Ms. Steinmetz explained that this stemmed from when Tom Reid presented to WPCAC a rule that was going to be taken to BER. At that time, they were still waiting for some comments from an informal comment period. This was before publication. Ms. Steinmetz explained that if they had made substantive changes to the rule then it should have come back, but only minor alterations were being made. Mr. North confirmed that if major changes are made after WPCAC has considered a rule, but before it is brought to the Board, that rule needs to come back to WPCAC for recommendations.

Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Enforcement –

Ms. Kari Smith, Compliance Section Supervisor of DEQ's Water Protection Bureau, spoke about the wastewater permit program. Ms. Smith said that Montana received delegation of the wastewater discharge permit program in 1974. Throughout the 1970s, each state reported to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the requirements of that delegation. At this time, information was transmitted between state and federal agencies via paper. In the 1980s, electronic information began to be implemented. A system called Permit Compliance System, requiring minimal amounts of information, was put into use. Throughout the 1980s, Montana reported basic facility information on about 45 major facilities, which were either large industry or communities that discharged more than 1 million gallons.

In the 1990s, there was a push to move all individual permits into the database system. At that time, Montana had around 200 permitted sites in this system.

Early in 2000, EPA began to look at designing an Oracle web-based system for states to report required data. Ms. Smith noted that Montana is unique in that it is considered a direct user, meaning that the state has equal access to the database system as the federal employees do. This allows Montana to know when things are changing. Around 2003 to 2005, the DOS system was moved to this web-based system, known as the Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS). This not only modernized the system, but it also added more information. In addition to a focus on the Clean Water Act (CWA), it also brought in the Clean Air Act and the Hazardous Waste Act. This database contains millions of records.

By 2007, Montana put all of its information into ICIS. Montana then began an extensive clean up project after seeing errors in the information. Montana was being blamed for non-compliance both within the state and from other states. Around this time, there was an emphasis in transparency in government and all of the data went public into a system referred to as Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO). This reported that Montana had about 75% non-compliant facilities.

In 2008, Montana added additional facilities into the database, bringing the state total to around 2,000 facilities. In early 2009, Montana was about 80% complete with validating the data. In September of 2009, a news article published in the New York Times brought attention to information gathered from the ECHO public database. This showed that between 70%-90% of facilities in the country were in violation of their permit conditions, there were serious water quality issues related to dischargers, and the major facilities were not actually doing too poorly while everyone else appeared to be discharging at will. DEQ's response was to continually look at their data. They discovered that they were running at 75% non-compliance, so they began to focus on inspections in this area. At the same time, in response to this article, EPA developed the 2009 Clean Water Action Plan. The focus of this plan was to ensure that every state was applying the CWA consistently and they required every state to improve water quality through strong oversight of the state program and through serious and prompt enforcement action of all violators.

Montana DEQ focused on effluent rather than paperwork violations because they presented the clearest impact to water quality. They looked at the number and severity of violations, and established criteria of percentages above the permit limit. In 2009, 15% of facilities that discharged were in violation of their permit limit by over 500%. DEQ focused inspections based on the greatest number of exceedances and the highest percentages. Five inspectors went out to these facilities to see whether there were human-caused errors in the information or if there was truly poor effluent quality. Of the facilities looked at, approximately 90% were in violation due to effluent quality. Often this was related to failing treatment systems or operator unfamiliarity with a system.

Ms. Smith worked with Mr. John Arrigo to develop a systematic approach on how to prioritize which facilities needed to move to formal action. By moving to formal action, DEQ would address the issues that EPA required under the Clean Water Action Plan, take timely and appropriate enforcement, and individually address only the facilities that truly had effluent violations. In 2013, about 20% of facilities are out of compliance with their permit.

Mr. Arrigo, Administrator of DEQ's Enforcement Division, added that, in response to the discovery of numerous systems in significant violation, DEQ knew that enforcement actions were necessary. Under the Water Quality Act, the penalties are very high. For example, the Department can issue an order and

assess penalties of up to \$10,000 per violation per day, up to a maximum of \$100,000. Mr. Arrigo said that DEQ did not want to hammer small towns with significant penalties. Former DEQ Director, Richard Opper, encouraged the Enforcement Division not to seek big penalties but to figure out how to return these systems to compliance. His idea was rather than spend money on penalties, which go into the general fund, DEQ should work with those in violation to return them to compliance.

Mr. Earl Salley asked whether the phrase “out of compliance” is referring to a daily status. Ms. Smith replied that it is a long-term. Most facilities are given monthly limits. They have daily maximums that they can put out in a day, and they have a 30 day average. For wastewater treatment plants, DEQ focused on conventional pollutants, which are pollutants typically associated with wastewater.

Mr. Arrigo said that for violations, DEQ can either issue an order or file a complaint in court. They chose to deal with these administratively. Instead of issuing an order, DEQ chose to go with administrative orders on consent (AOC). When issuing an order, the party has 30 days to appeal it to BER. It is a contested case hearing, which takes time and money. To get systems to agree, DEQ offers them a consent order, which is an agreement signed by both sides. It lists all the violations that DEQ has identified, and is attached to the order. They do not seek penalties for these past violations provided that they agree to fix the violations in accordance with the compliance schedule. Human-caused errors must be fixed, in addition to system issues. System upgrades are a costly undertaking. This process involves hiring an engineer to assess the system, doing a preliminary engineering review to evaluate options, and selecting a preferred alternative. Then the community usually applies to the legislature for funding under Treasure State Endowment Program. There are also resource development block grants from DNRC and federal grants. Additionally, DEQ manages the State Revolving Fund that loans money at a low interest rate. So, these entities apply for a funding package and these applications are evaluated and ranked by the agencies, and then are submitted to legislature in the form of a bill. The legislature votes on the ranking and approves it. As the money comes in, these entities are given the loans or grants.

Under the AOC, DEQ orders those in violation to submit a plan on how they will return to compliance. This plan must include when the preliminary engineering report will be complete, when the specifications for the design will be submitted, when construction will be complete, and when the facility will be in compliance with the permit and the law. Usually, they will submit a schedule to DEQ and, if deemed reasonable, they adopt it into the order as a compliance schedule that must be followed. If anything comes up that may cause a delay, facilities can let DEQ know and they will consider amending the order and modifying the schedule. These orders are not complete passes, Mr. Arrigo stated. Once facilities sign the orders, they will still be assessed minor penalties for future violations to help keep them on track to compliance.

Administrative orders on consent have been a very successful enforcement method, according to Mr. Arrigo. He added that if someone appeals an order or permit, the Department has to pay for the Board’s attorney, which is expensive. Offering an AOC from the outset helps to avoid these costs. Additionally, as said by DEQ’s Director, Tracy Stone-Manning, it allows an opportunity to build relationships with the regulated community. Mr. Arrigo said that the Enforcement Division is resolving most of their cases with AOCs.

Mr. Arrigo, speaking of the minor penalties assessed for future violations, said that often the current system cannot meet the permit limits. In these cases, slightly looser enforcement limits will be established in the order and penalties are only assessed when those limitations are exceeded.

Mr. Salley asked whether it is easier for communities to pay the penalties than to address the issues. Mr. Arrigo responded that most communities do not want to violate their permit limits. Towns want to grow and continue to be able to provide adequate services. When dealing with industry, Mr. Arrigo said that this might be a problem, but that major violations are treated differently in that there is a 10% penalty assessed for past violations. Additionally, AOCs are not an option for effluent spills. Typically it is not advantageous to pay continue paying the penalties rather than addressing the problem.

Mr. Salley inquired whether the handout that was provided was something that could be accessed on an annual basis. Mr. Arrigo said that he would be happy to give WPCAC a copy on an annual basis. He also noted that statistical reports, including some that show all of Enforcement's work for the past year, are available on the Enforcement Division page of DEQ's website. Ms. Steinmetz offered to send WPCAC members a link to the webpage.

Mr. Salley then asked whether there has been a decrease in violations. Ms. Smith answered that, yes, there has been improvement. She said that well above 50% of facilities are operating in compliance. The compliance staff has found opportunities for education and outreach. They have been able to help people complete forms and answer common questions. Along with this, they have also noticed that the relationship with the towns has improved as well. According to Ms. Smith, about 20% of towns are still struggling, but 80% of them have either improved are operating in compliance.

In response to a request to explain violation significance, Ms. Smith said that the criteria have been established by EPA. What they consider significant is based on a select group of conventional parameters. They consider any monthly violation that is greater than 40% of the permit limit to be significant. This is ranked by severity as a Category 1. There is another group, Category 2, which includes less severe violations.

Mr. Cole noted that Whitehall had two entries on the handout. Mr. Arrigo said that this was merely a duplicate entry. He added that each of the entries on the handout have their own story behind them. Also, he said that the Water Protection Bureau permits are incredibly broad. The handout reflects primarily municipal wastewater treatment systems, but the permits even include things like concentrated animal feeding operations and construction stormwater.

Ms. Bucklin Sanchez asked why some facilities are listed in blue on the handout. Mr. Arrigo responded that the blue indicates a signed order on consent. Ms. Bucklin Sanchez then said that she likes the Montana Drinking Water Watch website because it is easy to use to find out water quality violations for specific towns. She asked if there is similar access already available for wastewater or if a system could be developed. Ms. Smith responded that the EPA ECHO webpage allows facility searches. She said this public system shows violations and is fairly interactive, and it is the public system for DEQ's data.

Ms. Bucklin Sanchez then noted that several communities listed on the handout have done recent system upgrades, and may no longer be in violation of their permit limits. She asked how a community gets off of the list after they have made the necessary system improvements. Mr. Arrigo responded that DEQ just needs to decide that they have completed everything in accordance with the order. Sometimes they are allowed an optimization period, when the system has been constructed but additional time is needed to see that it works. Mr. Arrigo said that it is the Enforcement Division's responsibility to track compliance with the orders, although communities can call Enforcement to say that they are finished with the requirements and would like to wrap up the order. One thing that Mr. Arrigo noted is that

some newly installed systems do not work as well as expected and the entity remains in violation. In these situations, it is in their benefit to remain under the AOC so that the penalties are less. If they close the AOC, it is not the Department's desire to start over and reduce penalties again.

Mr. Cole asked whether Enforcement has looked at all cities and towns in Montana. Ms. Smith replied that monthly violation letters are sent out to any town that has a permit and is in violation of its limits. This means that any town that has a permit will know its status each month. Towns that are considered non-discharging, meaning that they do not have a pipe to a creek or river, are not facilities that Ms. Smith works with. In these cases, DEQ's Technical and Financial Assistance Bureau and the Enforcement Division may collaboratively become involved. Mr. Arrigo added that DEQ's State Revolving Fund engineers are involved in funding construction of these systems, and they do follow up and provide technical assistance on these operations. They periodically go to all these systems, permitted or not, and discover those that are not operating according to the approved design.

ACTION ITEMS

New World Mine Temporary Standards –

Mr. Dave Feldman, of DEQ's Water Quality Planning Bureau, gave a summary of the background of the New World Mining District. This site is located just north of Cooke City, Montana. Early mining exploration began here in the 1860s. Extensive mining occurred in the area between 1904 and 1955, and then minor activity continued here until 1989, when a large ore body was discovered roughly 4.5 miles from the northeast entrance of Yellowstone National Park.

Concerns about the potential effects of the water quality in the park led to a lawsuit. The federal government negotiated a deal with the Crown Butte Mining Industry and Miranda Incorporated to purchase the land and forfeit the mineral rights within the area. The United States Forest Service (USFS) was given the land and has led the remediation efforts, along with EPA and Montana DEQ. In 1999, Montana BER adopted temporary water quality standards for Daisy Creek, Fisher Creek, and the Stillwater River. The manmade and geological effects have made these waters extremely acidic, and portions of these waters are completely devoid of aquatic life. The temporary water quality standards and related provisions for the New World Mining District can be found in Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 17.30.630. These were passed under Montana Code Annotated (MCA) 75-5-312. These temporary standards allow USFS the ability to clean up Daisy Creek, Fisher Creek, and the Stillwater River without violating the CWA in the short-term. The Board adopted the temporary standards with a 15-year deadline. The temporary standards for these streams will expire in June 2014. MCA allows a temporary water quality standard to remain in place for no longer than 20 years.

The Department is requesting advice from WPCAC to initiate rulemaking that would extend of the temporary water quality standard to June 4, 2019. This would allow time to fully evaluate these streams as they are now and to properly classify them under state law following the extensive work by USFS to remediate the streams.

Ms. Mary Beth Marks, who has been leading the New World Mining District remediation effort for USFS, then presented the statement that she plans to make to BER. The presentation exactly followed the handout titled "Statement to the Board of Environmental Review: Progress Update," which referred to an additional handout containing figures and graphs with additional information about the New World Mining District.

Mr. Feldman acknowledged the hard work that USFS has completed in remediating the effects of the mine wastes. He said that the work has improved the water quality in these streams, but he noted that need more time is needed to study the streams so that they can be permanently classified within ARM. Mr. Feldman recommended that the council agree to the temporary standards extension to allow for completion of this work.

Chairperson Selch, referring to Table 1, asked why dates in the middle column overlapped with the final column. Ms. Marks answered that 2001 was when the reclamation work began, and 2008 was when the major reclamation work was completed. Although the dates in the columns overlapped, they were separated to take a more detailed look at the 2008 to 2013 timeframe.

Mr. Keith Smith asked what they hope to achieve during these additional five years. He explained that Table 1 did not show a significant drop in criteria from 2008 to 2013, though he noted that he was unsure how they compared to DEQ-7 standards. He said that it sounds like the remediation work is complete, and monitoring is the focus now in the hope of continued water improvement. He asked what will happen if there is no improvement. Mr. Feldman responded that they are leaving options on the table to evaluate the streams and to see where they fit in the system. From this, they will work to classify the streams within ARM. Ms. Marks added that Figures 4, 6, and 7 show how far out of compliance the area is with DEQ-7. She said that, for copper and other criteria, they are still quite a bit above DEQ-7 standards. She mentioned that they have done quite a bit of work to see what the water quality in the area was prior to mining. The data suggests that there were always exceedances due to the mineralized nature of the area.

Mr. Smith asked whether there will be an adjusted standard higher than DEQ-7 if the background has always been higher. Ms. Marks replied that this is her understanding.

Mr. Cole inquired whether they are doing anything like this in other locations in Montana where there has been mining. Mr. Feldman responded that this is the only place in the state where this is occurring because New World Mine streams are the only ones in the state that have temporary standards on the books right now. He emphasized that the key word is temporary, so they need to be accommodated within the system. Mr. Cole then asked if they are considering doing something similar anywhere else in the state. Mr. Feldman said no.

Ms. Bucklin Sanchez, referring to the second paragraph on page four of the "Statement to the Board of Environmental Review," asked about reclassification when monitoring is completed. Ms. Marks explained that other known mining sources in the area are those on private land. In the beginning of USFS work at the New World Mining District, an inventory of all mining features in the district was done. They have gone through each of these to determine whether an action was necessary. The last look at what is remaining in that area included water quality as well as volume and location of waste. She said there are still waste dumps that are located far from streams, and they do not believe the streams will be impacted by those wastes. She also said that there are some waste sites where they have done everything technically feasible to address the issue. For example, they considered putting a water treatment plant on a draining adit, but the decision was made to use an alternative. Ms. Marks said that there are some additional issues that could be addressed but that they would require significant funding and technology.

Ms. Bucklin Sanchez then asked what the advantage of the temporary standards extension would be to DEQ, and whether this would allow them to collect five more years of data. Mr. Feldman replied that

DEQ is only planning on collecting data through 2015. They will evaluate the streams and determine the aquatic life population, and then they will try to develop water quality standards that will protect the aquatic life and the uses of the streams. They must develop a system that will protect the uses of the stream for the CWA. The advantage to the state is that the standards will be moved from temporary to permanent, and they will be able to provide a more accurate level of protection.

Ms. Steinmetz asked if Ms. Bucklin Sanchez is wondering why not let the DEQ standards go to DEQ-7 standards. Ms. Bucklin Sanchez replied that as the streams are unlikely to meet DEQ-7 standards in the future, she is curious about the advantage of waiting for five years to reclassify rather than, for example, two years. Ms. Steinmetz answered that the rulemaking processes take time. The reason that they want to extend these temporary standards is that they will expire and automatically revert to DEQ-7 standards in six months. The DEQ-7 standards are not practical for the site. Extending the temporary standards for the full five years simply buys more time to make sure that DEQ is choosing the best option for reclassification.

Ms. Steinmetz said that there are different options that Mr. Feldman will be exploring. They could leave it a B-1, knowing that there would always be exceedances and it would always be impaired. They could also look at removing uses. Water use classes assign uses to a waterbody. While it is difficult to remove uses in Montana, it is a possibility and, according to Ms. Steinmetz, it might be an appropriate course in a case like this. Another option would be setting site-specific standards that would be similar to the temporary standards but would be permanent and appropriate to the individual stream. Ms. Steinmetz said that exploring these options will be a lot of work and will take time. DEQ would value input from WPCAC members on what they see as the best course.

Ms. Marks added that the DC-2 data in Figure 5 shows that there have been improvements in the water quality due to the capping at the McLaren Pit. Downstream on Daisy Creek, at DC-5, there has been some improvement during high flow but not much during low flow. Additionally, CFY-2, on Fisher Creek, is not showing an improvement. Ms. Marks said that what this demonstrates is the influence of the area's natural mineralized geology.

Ms. Marks also said that USFS is committed to continuing the monitoring at the site. They have the funding set aside. She said that there is one school of thought that there will be some improvement in the water quality over the next five years. They are interested in seeing how good they can get the water quality. This is another reason to continue the extension of the temporary standards.

Chairperson Selch asked if other metals at the site have followed a similar trend to copper. The answer was yes, other metals are also decreasing along a similar trend but they simply do not exceed DEQ-7 standards as often as copper does.

Next, Chairperson Selch asked when the last reclamation work was done at the site. Ms. Marks said it was the road reclamation work done in 2011, which was aimed at reducing sediment rather than metals.

Chairperson Selch then inquired how the natural background would be further evaluated. According to Ms. Marks, that report has been submitted to the state, reviewed, and accepted. They had a hydrogeology technical working group on the project, which was composed of United States Geological Survey (USGS), National Park Service, and EPA experts. Mr. Shane Matolyak was responsible for putting the report together. USGS was instrumental in the sampling. Iron precipitates were collected as they were being precipitated in the stream. These were then analyzed. Additionally, ferrete deposits

collected in the stream were dated for age. They were determined to be pre-mining. These historic deposits were compared to today's deposits and, based on that, predictions of pre-mining water quality were made. They then looked at current water quality data compared to pre-mining quality. Ms. Marks said that the water quality is not quite where it used to be, but it is not far off relative to iron, pH, and copper.

Mr. Matolyak said that USGS looked at current conditions in the stream and the relative ratios of iron and copper, and isotopes of both, as well as pH conditions. They then figured out a formula to make inferences about the water quality at the time that the ferecrete was being deposited. They were able to radiocarbon date the ferecrete chunks, which turned out to be 8,000 years old. Mr. Matolyak said that there are historic accounts from early miners of bogs precipitating copper chunks. Ms. Marks added that the report also documented some natural copper bogs that had not been affected by mining.

Ms. Marks said that throughout the course of the work, the state consistently asked for reference streams. She said that this was difficult. All of the mining was in the headwaters of these streams, and when looking outside of the disturbed areas at other nearby streams, the geology is totally different.

Chairperson Selch asked if these streams were fishless prior to mining. Mr. Clint Sestrich confirmed this. He said that there are high gradient reaches with waterfalls that serve as a physical blockade and the background might have served as a barrier as well.

Ms. Barbara Hall asked where the funding for this work has come from. Ms. Marks explained that the CWA lawsuit against the Crown Butte Mining Company led to a buyout in which President Clinton, on behalf of the American people, bought out the mining company for 65 million dollars. Of that, 22.5 million dollars was put into an interest-bearing account to do cleanup work at the site. This cleanup took 12 years to complete, and there is now about 4 million dollars left in the fund. Ms. Marks said that the community environmental groups that USFS has worked with have been very involved in the project. One thing that they asked of USFS was that they not just walk away from the project after the work was done. USFS is committed to remaining at the site to maintain it, fix any erosion or vegetation issues that arise, and continue long-term monitoring. The USFS maintenance and operations plan, which includes monitoring, is scheduled for 20 years. Mr. Feldman added that DEQ wants to make sure that they are setting reasonable targets for USFS to meet.

Chairperson Selch sought a motion for recommendation to extend the New World Mine temporary standards for another five years. Mr. Salley moved to recommend the extension. Ms. Stevie Neuman and Mr. Cole seconded the motion. A vote was held. All present council members voted in favor of recommending the temporary standards extension; the motion carried.

Adoption of the 2013 Meeting Calendar –

Ms. Steinmetz asked whether WPCAC members would prefer to continue having Friday meetings or choose another day. Mr. Cole, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Michael Wendland preferred Fridays; the council agreed to continue with Friday meetings. The preliminarily scheduled September 5, 2014 meeting was rescheduled to August 29, 2014.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting –

The next WPCAC meeting is February 21, 2014. Ms. Steinmetz said she expects that the reclassification of Muddy Creek and Prickly Pear Creek will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Ms. Steinmetz said that it might be beneficial to go over the different functions within the Water Quality Act. She suggested briefly focusing on a different piece at each 2014 meeting, beginning with standards in February. Several council members expressed interest in this idea.

Chairperson Selch mentioned that nominations for the 2014 WPCAC Chairperson will be accepted from now through February 21, 2014. There will be a vote for the Chairperson at the next meeting.

Ms. Steinmetz encouraged WPCAC members to suggest meeting topics of interest. It is possible to arrange presenters to come and speak about these issues.

Ms. Steinmetz asked the council whether they are satisfied with the way that they have been receiving the meeting materials. She also asked for comments on the best means of sending and receiving the information. Ms. Hall and Mr. Salley said that they prefer email. There were no suggestions for improving the system of distributing meeting information.

Public Comment -

There were no public comments.

ADJOURN

Chairperson Selch sought a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Salley moved to adjourn and Chairperson Selch seconded the motion. All were in favor; the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

REFERENCED LINKS FOR MEETING MATERIALS

(Sites last updated 12/17/2013)

December 17, 2013 Agenda -

<http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/WPCAC/agendasMinutes/2013/December17/AGENDA12-17-13.pdf>

Agenda Links:

Approved Minutes from December 4, 2013 -

<http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/WPCAC/agendasMinutes/2013/December17/12-4-13ApprovedMinutes.pdf>

MPDES Permit Enforcement Memo -

<http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/WPCAC/agendasMinutes/2013/December17/MPDESEnforcMemo.pdf>

New World Mine Temporary Standards Rule -

<http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/WPCAC/agendasMinutes/2013/December17/NewWorldTempStdRule.pdf>

New World Mine Temporary Standards Memo -

<http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/WPCAC/agendasMinutes/2013/December17/NWMTempStdMemo.pdf>

New World Mine Statement to BER -

http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/WPCAC/agendasMinutes/2013/December17/WPCAC_Statement_dec2013.pdf

Enforcement AOC Handout -

http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/WPCAC/agendasMinutes/2013/December17/WQA_CasesAOCs_12162013.pdf

New World Mine Handout -

http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/WPCAC/agendasMinutes/2013/December17/WPCAC_2013_Handout.pdf

Submitted by,

Sarah Norman 12/30/2013